



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,880	08/28/2003	Joseph Sheinis	5681-64700	8735
35690	7590	08/24/2007		
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C. P.O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398			EXAMINER SEYE, ABDOU K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2194	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/650,880

Applicant(s)

SHEINIS ET AL.

Examiner

Abdou Karim Seye

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on May 29, 2007 has been received and entered. The currently pending claims considered below are Claims 1-28.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-7, 10-13 and 15-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Granade, et al. (US 20020103881)**.

Claim 1, Granade, teaches a system, comprising: an application server (fig.1/112) comprising: an application component whose data is represented in a system default locale (fig. 2/203; paragraph 75); localization logic configured to translate input parameters or return values between the system default locale and another locale (fig. 2/202; paragraph 42, 50 and 62); and interception logic configured to intercept a plurality of method calls to the application component (fig. 2/102; back end application); wherein the interception logic is

Art Unit: 2194

configured to invoke the localization logic and the application component in response to one or more of the plurality of method calls (paragraph 50 and 63; invoking the integration manager application passing resulting information produced to the mobile device).

Claim 2, Granade teaches,

wherein the localization logic is separate from the application component (fig. 2/203 and 202 are separated).

Claim 3, Granade teaches,

wherein the application component is configured to operate on data stored in a primary database table in which the data is represented in the system default locale (fig. 2/210 paragraph 37).

Claim 4, Granade teaches,

wherein the application component is configured to invoke one or more Java Data Base Connectivity methods to maintain the primary database table; the claimed element "java" in (paragraph 42) of grenade reference meets the claimed limitation of the claim.

Art Unit: 2194

Claim 5, Granade teaches, wherein the localization logic is configured to operate on data stored in one or more localization database tables in which the data is represented in a locale other than the system default locale (fig. 2/102; paragraph 26 and 36).

As per claim 6, it is rejected in the same reasons as claim 4 above.

Claim 7, Granade teaches, wherein the interception logic includes one or more dynamic proxies that are configured to intercept application component method calls before the execution of the method (paragraph 37).

Claim 10, Granade teaches, a metadata file indicating the system default locale and translatable table information for the application component (paragraph 38).

As per claims 11,12, 13 15,16,17,18 and 19 , they are rejected for the same reasons as the claims above.

As per claims 20, they are rejected for the same reasons as the claims above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2194

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Granade, et al. (US 20020103881) in view of Upton (20030110315).**

Claims 8 and 14, Granade teaches a localization unit that includes methods as in claim 1 above, wherein these method could be written in java (paragraph 42), but he does not explicitly discloses,

wherein the localization logic is configured to make one or more Java reflection calls to determine whether input parameters to, or return values from the application component are localizable. However, in the same field of endeavor, Upton discloses a JSP templates that can leverage the internationalization and localization feature of the java platform (paragraph 99) and the use of java API reflection to determine methods to invoke on a request (paragraph 81 and 121).

It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Granade's invention with Upton's invention to include java reflection API within the localization logic to make java reflection calls to determine whether input parameters to, or return values from the application component are localizable, because it would greatly simplify the interaction with the back end database resources

Art Unit: 2194

for methods call and the return values. One would have been motivated to include Java reflection API in an integrated system with web access to the back end systems in order to get and set the value of an object's field such as local data, even if the field name is unknown to your program until runtime. Therefore to get fast information retrieval from storage area.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Granade, et al. (US 20020103881)** in view of **Graham et al. (20020046240)**.

Claim 9, Granade teaches a localization logic as in claim 1 above, but he does not explicitly disclose,

wherein the localization logic configured to invoke localization functions before and after the execution of the method. However, in the same field of endeavor, Graham discloses a "GetLocale ()" method to determine a user's current locale (paragraph 34) and a logic methods to validate and process the fields before and after invoking the execution of the method (paragraph 67, 68, 82, 83 and 84). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Granade's invention with Graham's invention to include a localization logic configured to invoke localization functions before and after the execution of the method, because it would help reduce user errors when accessing data in a storage area. One would have been motivated to use a validation method within a localization function in order provide users of client /server environment a redisplay of localized error message associated

Art Unit: 2194

with input fields saved, so the user does not have to re-enter any valid information.

Therefore to improve efficiency of the overall system.

As per claims 21-28, they are rejected for the same reasons as the claims above.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed May 29, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per claim 1:

a. Applicant argues that, "Granade fails to teach interception logic configured to intercept a plurality of method calls to the application component, Wherein the interception logic is configured to invoke the localization logic in response to one or more of the plurality of method calls". Granade teaches in (paragraph 50,63 and paragraph 42; applications and method functions that comprises the integration manager) the step of invoking the integration manager (localization logic) in response of calls from application functions for accessing data stored in the backend system and passing resulting information produced back to the mobile device. This middleware sitting between the interception logic (backend systems) and the front end application is always invoked during client request for access to data stored in the back end systems.

Art Unit: 2194

Therefore this teaching of Granade's reference meets the claimed limitation of the claim.

b. Applicant argues that "there is no teaching or suggestion in Granade that the integration manager 202 is configured to invoke the localization component 210". The examiner disagrees since, in (paragraph 80) Granade teaches "configuring the system to operate.....". Therefore this claimed element of Granade's reference meets the claimed limitation of the claim.

As per claim 11,

a. applicant argues that " Granade fails to teach or suggest any method comprising creating a dynamic proxy". The examiner disagrees since, grenade teaches using Java and CORBA in (paragraph 42). The reason that "JAVA" and "CORBA" are used is to dynamically generate proxies. Therefore these claimed elements of Granade's reference meet the claimed limitation of the claim.

b. applicant argues that " Granade fails to teach a method comprising modifying a service locator to return an interface to the proxy". The examiner disagrees since, in (paragraph 36) Granade teaches, "updating information on the back end applications". This claimed element of Granade's reference suggests changes in the service locator, therefore meets the claimed limitation of the claim.

As per claim 12, applicant argues that Granade fails to teach or suggest a method comprising determining whether input parameters or return values associated with the method call are localizable". The examiner disagrees since, Granade teaches "a default process if information obtained from the mobile device is not localizable (paragraph 36-38). Therefore this teaching of Granade's reference suggests the claimed limitation of the claim.

Conclusion

8. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier

Art Unit: 2194

communications from the examiner should be directed to Exr. Abdou Seye whose telephone number is (571) 270-1062. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, contact the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson at (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for formal or official faxes to Technology Center 3600 is (571) 273-8300. Draft or informal faxes, which will not be entered in the application, may be submitted directly to the examiner at (571) 273-6722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600

AKS

August 14, 2007


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER